

990165

PATENT

## REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in the present application (the Office Action of November 17, 2004 incorrectly states that only claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 are pending). In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 were rejected and claims 2, 4, and 6 were objected to. Applicant traverses the rejections as follows.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald, Jr. et al. (US 2002/0077750) in view of Jones et al. (6,337,972). It was alleged that McDonald teaches, among other things, applying a predetermined mapping scheme to convert a "value" into a consolidated output. It was further alleged that the combination of McDonald and Jones teaches all of the remaining features of claims 1, 3, 5, and 7, rendering these claims obvious.

Applicant does not agree that McDonald teaches applying a predetermined mapping scheme to convert a "value" into a consolidated output. It was alleged that McDonald teaches such a mapping scheme in paragraphs 0028-0030 and/or paragraph 0045 of McDonald.

Paragraphs 0028-0030 do not describe converting a value into a consolidated output. They describe a system located onboard a concrete truck for sensing various "delivery states" of the truck and transmitting this information to a remote location. Paragraph 0029 describes the various delivery states as "At Terminal", "Loading", "Leaving Terminal", etc. Paragraph 0030 describes the transmission of delivery state messages, including a location of the concrete truck based on a GPS receiver. There is no description whatsoever of a mapping scheme to convert these alleged "status messages" into a consolidated output.

Paragraph 45, likewise, does not describe a mapping scheme for converting a value into a consolidated output. It simply describes transmission of the various delivery status messages (such as "At Job Site", "Begin Pour", and "End Pour") once certain conditions are detected by a "vehicle condition sensor". Again, there is no description of a mapping scheme to convert these alleged "status messages" into a consolidated output.

Neither McDonald (nor Jones for that matter) describes a mapping scheme to convert information into a consolidated output. Therefore, Applicant believes that the rejection to claim 1, 5, and 7 should be withdrawn, as each of these independent claims comprises a mapping scheme for converting a "value" into a consolidated output.

990165

PATENT

Furthermore, claim 3 should be allowed as being dependent on claim 1, which Applicant believes to be allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 17, 2004

By: 

Thomas M. Thibault  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,181

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 651-2356  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502